

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 \* \* \*

6 MARIO ANTONIO LEMUS,

Case No. 3:21-cv-00425-MMD-CLB

7 Petitioner,

ORDER

8 v.

9 TIMOTHY GARRETT, *et al.*,

10 Respondents.

11 Respondents seek an extension of time to file their reply in support of their motion  
12 to dismiss. (ECF No. 51 (“Motion”).) The Court finds that the request is made in good faith  
13 and not solely for the purpose of delay, and that good cause exists to grant the Motion.

14 Habeas actions are civil actions under federal practice and are subject to the  
15 reporting requirements of the Civil Justice Reform Act of 1990 (“CJRA”), 28 U.S.C. § 471,  
16 *et seq.*<sup>1</sup> Given the age of this case, Respondents will have a final extension to file their  
17 reply. Given the Court’s case management responsibilities under the CJRA, moving  
18 forward counsel will be required to prioritize the briefing of the motion to dismiss in this  
19 case over later-filed matters.

20 It is therefore ordered that Respondents’ first motion for enlargement of time (ECF  
21 No. 51) is granted. Respondents have until August 15, 2025, to file their reply.

22 DATED THIS 2<sup>nd</sup> Day of July 2025.

23  
24 

25 MIRANDA M. DU  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

26  
27 <sup>1</sup>The CJRA provides that each United States District Court must develop a civil  
28 justice expense and delay reduction plan to facilitate the deliberate adjudication of civil  
cases on the merits, monitor and improve litigation management, and reduce cost and  
delay. See *also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 1. The CJRA mandates the early and on-going judicial  
management of case progress. See 28 U.S.C. § 473(a).